

### **Letter A-7 – City of Chula Vista**

- A-7-1** The County acknowledges and appreciates the comment. It will be included as part of the FEIR and considered by the decision makers. However, the comment provides factual background information taken from the DEIR and provides general introductory information that does not raise any issue or include any substantive comment with regard to the adequacy of the DEIR. For that reason, the County provides no further response to this comment.
- A-7-2** The County concurs with the comment that access to the “Not a Part” parcel should be maintained. A 20-foot access easement to the owner(s) of the “Not a Part” parcel is shown on sheet 6 of 15 of the Tentative Map/ Preliminary Grading Plan TM 5631(B). The owner(s) will receive electronic access into the private gated roads for the purpose of accessing the subject property.
- A-7-3** The County concurs with the comment that these easements are no longer compatible. However, the existing access easements, per the referenced documents, will be terminated by quitclaim. The subject property, intended to be accessed by the easements, is no longer held by the City of Chula Vista.
- A-7-4** The County does not concur with this comment. The commenter indicates that the proposed Project does not provide criteria to ensure that road construction on Otay Lakes Road is consistent with the City of Chula Vista General Plan guidance for scenic highways. Portions of Otay Lakes Road within the proposed Project are within County of San Diego’s jurisdiction and is designated as a County Designated Scenic Highway. As identified in the EIR, approval of the proposed Project and the concurrent amendments to the County General Plan and Otay SRP would establish consistency between the Specific Plan, the County General Plan, and the Otay SRP, and there would be no impact to applicable goals, policies, or requirements of the Otay SRP. Further, the City of Chula Vista General Plan states that the portion of Otay Lakes Road from Bonita Road to Telegraph Canyon Road is designated as a scenic roadway. The portion of Otay Lakes Road that would be widened as a part of the Project does not fall between these two roads. Therefore, the EIR does not need to consider City of Chula Vista General Plan guidance on this matter.
- A-7-5** The County concurs that TM 13B, Sheet 9 includes an area of FMZ that would be located on an adjacent property. The FMZ area is roughly the width of the outer thinning zone. Based on the shape of Lot 12, the only lot that would be impacted by the reduced FMZ, it was determined that it may be possible to place the structure to the south on the lot and move the FMZ onto the lot, achieving the 100-foot FMZ. However, should that effort not achieve 100 feet, then the FPP will be revised to include an alternative materials and methods approach for Lot 12 requiring landscape and/or construction enhancements that would be determined to meet the intent of achieving the full 100 feet of FMZ. This practice is common and can result in more ignition-resistant structures and landscapes.
- A-7-6** The County agrees with the comment that streets within this Project are not designed in a grid system and that some may exceed the 2,000-foot length maximum per the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP Mobility policies. However, the village was designed to work well with the existing topography and to minimize cut-and-fill slopes in an effort to reduce the environmental footprint. The implementation of a grid system of streets on this hillside project would result in a dramatic increase in grading quantities. In lieu of this, all streets are designed with a minimum of two access points provided for each neighborhood within the village and collector streets are provided where dictated by traffic count.

- A-7-7** There are no existing /formal direct trail connections to Otay Valley Regional Park (OVRP). The trails map identifies potential connection points from the Otay Lakes Road right-of-way that lead to the larger County/City master trail plan elements. The County is currently updating the San Diego County Trails Master Plan for the South County region and may consider the project trails/pathway as potential connections.
- A-7-8** See Response to Comment A-4-76.
- A-7-9** The County concurs with the comment and the Tentative Map has been revised to notate the dual force mains, as shown on sheet 6 of 13 of TM 5361(A).
- A-7-10** The County acknowledges and appreciates the comment. The City of San Diego has been consulted regarding runoff and water quality issues into the Lower Otay Reservoir. See Response to Comment A-3-53.
- A-7-11** The County acknowledges and appreciates this comment. The City of San Diego, as the owner of the property on which the airstrip is located, has been notified of the Project. Issues pertaining to 29 CFR Part 77 are beyond the scope of this EIR.
- A-7-12** The County disagrees with the comment John Nichols Field is a permanent facility. The airfield is a private use facility on land leased from City of San Diego. As the owner of the land, the City of San Diego has the discretion to terminate the use of the land as an airstrip. Further, the recommendation and analysis given in the EIR would be the same regardless of whether the ultra-light gliding and parachuting airfield is temporary or permanent. Therefore, a change is not needed to the EIR's description of the airfield.
- A-7-13** The County acknowledges this comment. The listed park acreage requirements are different because they are based on different standards. The County Park Land Dedication Ordinance determines the amount of dedicated land to parks based on the total area of dwelling units constructed, while the Otay SRP based its acreage requirements on resident population. However, as stated in Section 3.6.2.4 of the Draft EIR, "The County PLDO requirement would be 16.63 acres and would be required to be improved by the developer. The current land plan for the proposed Project includes improvement of 21.9 net acres of public neighborhood parks, which would fully comply with the County PLDO requirement, as well as the Otay SRP requirement of 20.9 acres based on providing 3 acres/1,000 residents." No changes will be made to any Project documents.
- A-7-14** The proposed Project does not rely upon City of Chula Vista park acreage to satisfy its park requirements. The Fiscal Impact Analysis identifies revenue to the City of Chula Vista in the form of sales tax revenue that can be used for the maintenance of City facilities. In addition, the Otay Ranch Tax Sharing Agreement (reference) provides the City a higher percentage of property tax revenue for Otay Ranch projects to fund impacts to the City from the development of Villages in the County.
- A-7-15** See Response to Comment A-7-14.
- A-7-16** The County disagrees with the comment animal control services will be provided by the City of Chula Vista. The Otay SRP identifies both the City of Chula Vista and the County providing such services. As stated in the Otay Ranch Resort Village PFFP – Animal Control Facilities, the

County South Shelter at 5821 Sweetwater Road in Bonita currently provides animal control services in the vicinity of the Project site.

**A-7-17** See Responses to Comments A-7-14 and A-7-16.

**A-7-18** The County disagrees with the comment the proposed Project will impact the planned library in the Civic Core of the Millenia Project. A County library facility is currently operational in Bonita, which can serve the residents of the proposed Project. The construction of the Millenia Library is not programmed in the current 5-year CIP budget and may not be constructed until many years after the development of the proposed Project.

**A-7-19** The County acknowledges and appreciates the comment. While the development of the University Project is in progress and no specific uses have been identified, it is reasonable to conclude the University, as an institute of higher education, will include library facilities and those facilities may be available to the public. The FEIR, page 3.6-5, has been revised to delete “is likely to” and insert “may also.”

**A-7-20** The SDCFA will be providing interim and permanent fire services to the Project site. The SDCFA has also recently identified strategic response resource repositioning that will provide more efficient and better coverage for the western portion of their service area that abuts the City of Chula Vista’s eastern boundaries. This repositioning and addition of response resources will also benefit Chula Vista, unless the existing automatic aid agreement is no longer honored or an updated agreement is not executed.

It is anticipated that the proposed Project would provide a fire station and a project-provided ALS, Schedule A engine company (may include 4.0 staffing). The station would be equipped with a Type I fire engine. An additional Type III engine will be relocated to the Village 13 Fire Station along with its Schedule B 3-man crew. Further enhancing the emergency medical response, changes in the Mercy ambulance configuration will provide for an ALS ambulance located at the Village 13 Fire Station.

In addition, through an agreement with a private developer, the SDCFA has recently added a fire truck (ladder truck) that is located at the existing Jamul Fire Station. This is a 4-person, ALS truck company that will be available to respond to the Resort and for vehicle rescue and other calls, as needed. This resource is in addition to the existing 3-person, ALS Type I engine currently located at the Jamul Fire Station.

In summary, emergency calls in Village 13 will be provided the following response from the new fire station (FS 34), (does not include likely response from Chula Vista fire department under automatic aid agreement):

- 7 firefighters on scene in less than 5 minutes
- 17 firefighters on scene in 15 to 17 minutes

**A-7-21** The County acknowledges and appreciates the comment. It will be included as part of the FEIR and considered by the decision makers. There will be two engine companies at the onsite fire station. See Response to Comment A-7-20 for details on how the SDCFA will respond to the proposed Project.

**A-7-22** The County acknowledges and appreciates the comment. It will be included as part of the FEIR and considered by the decision makers. See Response to Comment A-7-20 for details regarding

the weight of the emergency response from the planned resource configuration at the Resort Village Fire Station and from off-site stations. There is no response by Chula Vista assumed for the proposed Project, but it is recommended that the existing automatic aid agreement be updated so that the City can benefit from the available resources and the SDCFA can reduce the arrival time of 17 firefighters.

- A-7-23** The County acknowledges and appreciates the comment. It will be included as part of the FEIR and considered by the decision makers. See Response to Comment A-7-20 for details regarding how the SDCFA will respond to the proposed Project and have the ability to establish an initial attack force.
- A-7-24** The County has determined that the SDCFA will provide enhancement of existing resources regarding emergency medical response. With the proposed Project, they will change the Mercy ambulance configuration and provide for an ALS ambulance located at the Village 13 Fire Station. Therefore, the ambulance will be transporting patients and if necessary, the engine could transport while still having coverage at the station by the Schedule B crew.
- A-7-25** The County acknowledges this comment but does not concur with it. The 1994 Salt Creek Basin Study, 2004 DIF update and the most recent 2015 DIF update will be in effect, and the construction of the Salt Creek Interceptor was completed based on the inclusion of flows from the proposed Project. Only recently had the City of Chula Vista proposed to remove County property flows from their planning and proposed 2015 DIF updates. . Subsequently the City of Chula Vista and County of San Diego executed a sewer transportation agreement on May 25, 2016, to allow Villages 13 and 14 to use the Salt Creek Interceptor to transmit sewer flows for treatment by the Metropolitan Sewer System.
- A-7-26** The County acknowledges this comment but does not concur with it. All onsite facilities are to be operated and maintained by the County of San Diego and have been analyzed using County criteria. Since the Project proposes to convey wastewater flows to the Salt Creek Interceptor, the total flows and EDUs from the Project using City of Chula Vista criteria were also provided. The Sewer Study provided as Appendix C-16 to the DEIR provides this information and it was also used in the March 25, 2015, analysis of the Salt Creek Interceptor.
- A-7-27** The County acknowledges this comment but does not concur with it. The onsite sewer system is proposed to be operated and maintained by the County of San Diego and the peaking factors per County requirements have been used accordingly.
- A-7-28** The County acknowledges this comment but does not concur with it. The 2004 DIF study was updated and approved in June 2015 by the City of Chula Vista. This update established a 2015 DIF fee; however, with the additions and deletion of projects, the fee actually remained the same rate as the 2004 DIF fee structure. Therefore, the DIF study information used in the DEIR is from the DIF program that is currently in effect. It is understood that the DIF is updated periodically and that the Project may be conditioned to apply the current fee structure at the time of pulling a building permit.
- A-7-29** The County acknowledges this comment. As discussed on page 5-8 of the sewer study provided as Appendix C-16 to the DEIR, the impact fees have been estimated by land use based on City Ordinance 2617. These fees are to be paid at the time of building permit and the actual fees to be paid will be based on the fee/factors in place at the time of building permit.

- A-7-30** The County acknowledges this comment and it is understood that the proposed Project will be conditioned to pay the appropriate fees at the time of building permit issuance.
- A-7-31** The County acknowledges this comment but does not concur with it. The onsite sewer system, including sewer lift stations, is to be operated and maintained by the County of San Diego and is required to be designed to County standards accordingly.
- A-7-32** The County acknowledges and concurs with this comment. An updated cumulative sewer study analysis was prepared using the City of Chula Vista Master Plan Modeling software and using updated land use projections and sewer generation factors. This analysis was summarized in a memorandum dated March 25, 2015. The results of this analysis confirm that the Salt Creek Interceptor has been sized to accommodate ultimate development in the service area, including the proposed Project. The results of this updated analysis will be included in the FEIR.
- A-7-33** See Response to Comment A-7-28.
- A-7-34** The County acknowledges this comment and agrees that the proposed Project will be required to measure flows being transferred to the City system. The approved Salt Creek Transportation Agreement (2016) includes provisions for flow metering and payments based on actual flows from the County of San Diego Sanitation District and City of Chula Vista. Triggers are identified in the agreement and will be handled as the Project sewer system is designed and constructed. This could either be done at the flow meter to be installed at Lift Station 1 or at a metering manhole downstream of where the force main from Lift Station 1 discharges.
- A-7-35** The County concurs with this comment. The GPA Report and Specific Plan revised the classification of Otay Lakes Road as a 4 Lane Boulevard with Raised Median from Hunte Parkway to Strada Piazza.
- A-7-36** The County does not concur with this comment. As to the comment noting that the proposed Project will not be developed within the City, that is, that the Project is not a City of Chula Vista project, the identified impacts within the City of Chula Vista will be mitigated through road improvements constructed as part of the City's TDIF program. As explained in Response to Comment A-4-103 above, the costs to construct the recommended improvements within the City of Chula Vista will be provided in full through applicable developer participation in the City's TDIF program. The developer of Resort Village/Village 13 will participate in that funding through its other Otay Ranch developments located within the City of Chula Vista. (See 2014 TDIF Update, Table A.)
- With respect to the comment regarding future maintenance costs associated with the Project's proposed widening of certain transportation facilities within the City, while it is correct that Project residential and commercial uses will not be paying City of Chula Vista property taxes, Project residents and business owners would not be prevented from patronizing Chula Vista businesses and, thereby, paying Chula Vista sales and gas taxes. Therefore, it is incorrect to claim that the proposed Project would generate none of these taxes for the benefit of Chula Vista.
- A-7-37** The County acknowledges and appreciates this comment. However, there is no Section 12.5.3 of the DEIR, and there are several different types of master plans referred to throughout the document, so it is unclear which master plan the commenter is referring to. Therefore, the County provides no further response to this comment.

- A-7-38** There are no direct trail connections from the Project to the OVRP. See Response to Comment A-7-7.
- A-7-39** Exhibit O of the PFFP will be revised to show potential connections from Otay Lakes Road to the OVRP.
- A-7-40** Limited trails and access will be allowed within the Preserve Edge Plan, only as a means to access the proposed regional trail system. The City of Chula Vista and County have a series of regional trails that will connect to the proposed trail system of the proposed Project. The open space areas and any trail system within them will be maintained and managed by the POM and their annual work programs.
- A-7-41** Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP, regarding Phase 2 of the RMP and the County/City Comprehensive Update.
- A-7-42** Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP, regarding Phase 2 of the RMP and the County/City Comprehensive Update.
- A-7-43** Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP, regarding Phase 2 of the RMP and the County/City Comprehensive Update.
- A-7-44** Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP, regarding Phase 2 of the RMP and the County/City Comprehensive Update.
- A-7-45** The County acknowledges and appreciates the comment. However, the commenter is providing comments on the Phase 2 RMP Update and does not provide comment on the adequacy of the DEIR (2015). The Phase 2 RMP Update was approved in September 2018. Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP for additional information.
- A-7-46** The County acknowledges and appreciates the comment. However, the commenter is providing comments on the Phase 2 RMP Update and does not provide comment on the adequacy of the DEIR (2015). The Phase II RMP Update was approved in September 2018. Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP for additional information.
- A-7-47** The County acknowledges and appreciates the comment. However, the commenter is providing comments on the Phase II RMP Update and does not provide comment on the adequacy of the DEIR (2015). The Phase II RMP Update was approved in September 2018. Please see Global Response 1: Phase II RMP for additional information.
- A-7-48** The County acknowledges and appreciates the comment. However, the commenter is providing comments on the Phase 2 RMP Update and does not provide comment on the adequacy of the DEIR (2015). The Phase 2 RMP Update was approved in September 2018. Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP for additional information.
- A-7-49** The County acknowledges and appreciates the comment. However, the commenter is providing comments on the Phase 2 RMP Update and does not provide comment on the adequacy of the DEIR (2015). The Phase 2 RMP Update was approved in September 2018. Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP for additional information.
- A-7-50** The County acknowledges and appreciates the comment. However, the commenter is providing comments on the Phase 2 RMP Update and does not provide comment on the adequacy of the

DEIR (2015). The Phase 2 RMP Update was approved in September 2018. Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP for additional information. **A-7-51** The County acknowledges and appreciates the comment. However, the commenter is providing comments on the Phase 2 RMP Update and does not provide comment on the adequacy of the DEIR (2015). The Phase 2 RMP Update was approved in September 2018. Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP for additional information.

**A-7-52** The County acknowledges and appreciates the comment. However, the commenter is providing comments on the Phase 2 RMP Update and does not provide comment on the adequacy of the DEIR (2015). The Phase 2 RMP Update was approved in September 2018. Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP for additional information.

**A-7-53** The County acknowledges and appreciates the comment. However, the commenter is providing comments on the Phase 2 RMP Update and does not provide comment on the adequacy of the DEIR (2015). The Phase II RMP Update was approved in September 2018. Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP for additional information.

**A-7-54** The County acknowledges and appreciates the comment. However, the commenter is providing comments on the Phase 2 RMP Update and does not provide comment on the adequacy of the DEIR (2015). The Phase 2 RMP Update was approved in September 2018. Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP for additional information.

**A-7-55** The County acknowledges and appreciates the comment. However, the commenter is providing comments on the Phase 2 RMP Update and does not provide comment on the adequacy of the DEIR (2015). The Phase 2 RMP Update was approved in September 2018. Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP for additional information.

**A-7-56** The County acknowledges and appreciates the comment. However, the commenter is providing comments on the Phase 2 RMP Update and does not provide comment on the adequacy of the DEIR (2015). The Phase 2 RMP Update was approved in September 2018. Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP for additional information.

**A-7-57** The County acknowledges and appreciates the comment. However, the commenter is providing comments on the Phase 2 RMP Update and does not provide comment on the adequacy of the DEIR (2015). The Phase 2 RMP Update was approved in September 2018. Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP for additional information. .

**A-7-58** The County acknowledges and appreciates the comment. However, the commenter is providing comments on the Phase 2 RMP Update and does not provide comment on the adequacy of the DEIR (2015). The Phase 2 RMP Update was approved in September 2018. Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP for additional information.

**A-7-59** The County acknowledges and appreciates the comment. However, the commenter is providing comments on the Phase 2 RMP Update and does not provide comment on the adequacy of the DEIR (2015). The Phase 2 RMP Update was approved in September 2018. Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP for additional information.

**A-7-60** The County acknowledges and appreciates the comment. However, the commenter is providing comments on the Phase 2 RMP Update and does not provide comment on the adequacy of the DEIR (2015). The Phase 2 RMP Update was approved in September 2018. Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP for additional information.

- A-7-61** The County acknowledges and appreciates the comment. However, the commenter is providing comments on the Phase 2 RMP Update and does not provide comment on the adequacy of the DEIR (2015). The Phase 2 RMP Update was approved in September 2018. Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP for additional information.
- A-7-62** The County acknowledges and appreciates the comment. However, the commenter is providing comments on the Phase 2 RMP Update and does not provide comment on the adequacy of the DEIR (2015). The Phase 2 RMP Update was approved in September 2018. Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP for additional information.
- A-7-63** Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP, regarding Phase 2 of the RMP and the County/City Comprehensive Update.
- A-7-64** Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP, regarding Phase 2 of the RMP and the County/City Comprehensive Update.
- A-7-65** Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP, regarding Phase 2 of the RMP and the County/City Comprehensive Update.
- A-7-66** Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP, regarding Phase 2 of the RMP and the County/City Comprehensive Update.
- A-7-67** Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP, regarding Phase 2 of the RMP and the County/City Comprehensive Update.
- A-7-68** The County acknowledges and appreciates the comment. However, the commenter is providing comments on the Phase 2 RMP Update and does not provide comment on the adequacy of the DEIR (2015). The Phase 2 RMP Update was approved in September 2018. Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP for additional information.
- A-7-69** The County acknowledges and appreciates the comment. However, the commenter is providing comments on the Phase 2 RMP Update and does not provide comment on the adequacy of the DEIR (2015). The Phase 2 RMP Update was approved in September 2018. Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP for additional information.
- A-7-70** The County acknowledges and appreciates the comment. However, the commenter is providing comments on the Phase 2 RMP Update and does not provide comment on the adequacy of the DEIR (2015). The Phase 2 RMP Update was approved in September 2018. Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP for additional information.
- A-7-71** The County acknowledges and appreciates the comment. However, the commenter is providing comments on the Phase 2 RMP Update and does not provide comment on the adequacy of the DEIR (2015). The Phase 2 RMP Update was approved in September 2018. Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP for additional information.
- A-7-72** The County acknowledges and appreciates the comment. However, the commenter is providing comments on the Phase 2 RMP Update and does not provide comment on the adequacy of the DEIR (2015). The Phase 2 RMP Update was approved in September 2018. Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP for additional information.
- A-7-73** The County acknowledges and appreciates the comment. However, the commenter is providing comments on the Phase 2 RMP Update and does not provide comment on the adequacy of the

DEIR (2015). The Phase 2 RMP Update was approved in September 2018. Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP for additional information.

- A-7-74** Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP, regarding Phase 2 of the RMP and the County/City Comprehensive Update.
- A-7-75** Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP, regarding Phase 2 of the RMP and the County/City Comprehensive Update.
- A-7-76** Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP, regarding Phase 2 of the RMP and the County/City Comprehensive Update.
- A-7-77** Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP, regarding Phase 2 of the RMP and the County/City Comprehensive Update.
- A-7-78** Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP, regarding Phase 2 of the RMP and the County/City Comprehensive Update.
- A-7-79** The County acknowledges and appreciates the comment. However, the commenter is providing comments on the Phase 2 RMP Update and does not provide comment on the adequacy of the DEIR (2015). The Phase 2 RMP Update was approved in September 2018. Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP for additional information.
- A-7-80** The County acknowledges and appreciates the comment. However, the commenter is providing comments on the Phase 2 RMP Update and does not provide comment on the adequacy of the DEIR (2015). The Phase 2 RMP Update was approved in September 2018. Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP for additional information.
- A-7-81** The County acknowledges and appreciates the comment. However, the commenter is providing comments on the Phase 2 RMP Update and does not provide comment on the adequacy of the DEIR (2015). The Phase 2 RMP Update was approved in September 2018. Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP for additional information.
- A-7-82** The County acknowledges and appreciates the comment. However, the commenter is providing comments on the Phase 2 RMP Update and does not provide comment on the adequacy of the DEIR (2015). The Phase 2 RMP Update was approved in September 2018. Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP for additional information.
- A-7-83** The County acknowledges and appreciates the comment. However, the commenter is providing comments on the Phase 2 RMP Update and does not provide comment on the adequacy of the DEIR (2015). The Phase 2 RMP Update was approved in September 2018. Please see Global Response 1: Phase 2 RMP for additional information.
- A-7-84** The County acknowledges and appreciates the comment. However, the comment provides concluding remarks and does not raise any new issue or include any new substantive comment concerning the adequacy of the DEIR. For that reason, the County provides no further response to this comment.